

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
WESTERN DIVISION

James E. Bernard, Jr.,)	
)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 13-2024
)	
Illinois Central Railroad)	
Company,)	
)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	
)	

ORDER ADOPTING THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Before the Court is the Magistrate Judge's April 29, 2014 Report and Recommendation (the "Report") recommending that the Court grant Defendant Illinois Central Railroad Company's Motion to Dismiss (the "Motion"). (Rep., ECF No. 41; Mot., ECF No. 26.) No objection has been filed to the Report and the time to do so has passed. For the following reasons, the Court ADOPTS the Report of the Magistrate Judge and DISMISSES the Complaint.

Congress enacted 28 U.S.C. § 636 to relieve the burden on the federal judiciary by permitting the assignment of district court duties to magistrate judges. See United States v. Curtis, 237 F.3d 598, 602 (6th Cir. 2001) (citing Gomez v. United States, 490 U.S. 858, 869-70 (1989)); see also Baker v.

Peterson, 67 F. App'x 308, 310 (6th Cir. 2003). "A district judge must determine de novo any part of a magistrate judge's disposition that has been properly objected to." Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). After reviewing the evidence, the court is free to accept, reject, or modify the proposed findings or recommendations of the Magistrate Judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). The district court is not required to review — under a de novo or any other standard — those aspects of the report and recommendation to which no objection is made. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). The district court should adopt the findings and rulings of the Magistrate Judge to which no specific objection is filed. Id. at 151.

The Magistrate Judge recommends that the Complaint be dismissed for failure to prosecute. (Report, ECF No. 41 at 3.) The Report states that any objections must be filed within fourteen (14) days of being served with the Report. (Rep. at 3.) See also 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) ("Within fourteen days after being served with a copy [of the Magistrate Judge's Report], any party may serve and file written objections to such proposed findings and recommendations as provided by the rules of the court.").

Because no party has objected, Arn counsels the Court to adopt the Report in its entirety. Arn, 474 U.S. at 151. Adopting the Report is consistent with the policies underlying §

636, specifically judicial economy and protecting against the "functions of the district court [being] effectively duplicated as both the magistrate and the district court perform identical tasks." Howard v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs., 932 F.2d 505, 509 (6th Cir. 1991).

For the foregoing reasons, the Court ADOPTS the Report and the Complaint is DISMISSED.

So ordered this 19th day of May, 2014.

s/ Samuel H. Mays, Jr.
SAMUEL H. MAYS, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE